



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

shatammu of Eanna, and the latter as the *shaqū sharri* and *bēl piqittu* of Eanna (see 47 : 2, 3/84 : 18, 19/94 : 3, 4, etc.). Nabû-mukîn-aplu as the *shatammu* occurs in these texts first in the sixth year of Cyrus (*YBT* VII 54 : 5), having followed Nidintum-Bêl in this office, which he continued to hold until the sixth year of Cambyses (190 : 13). Nabû-aḥ-iddin held this office from the seventeenth year of the previous reign (Dougherty *YBT* VI 156 : 3) unto the fourth year of Cambyses (Tremayne *YBT* VII 172 : 10). The writer of Scheil's tablet, Anu-shar-uṣur, was the *qīpu* of Eanna in the reign of Cyrus (*YBT* VII 7 : 7). This office was apparently higher in rank than the other two that have been mentioned (see *YBT* VII 7 : 7; *YBT* III 10 : 2/61 : 10).

These facts show that the letter published by Scheil was written in the reign of Cyrus, when Gobryas was governor of Babylon; and also that, until other evidence is obtained, we can only conclude that the activity of Gobryas in Babylonia began with the reign of Cyrus. It would seem also from the references to soldiers as belonging to rolls of Nebuchadrezzar, Neriglissar, and Nabonidus during the reign of Cyrus that this was a method of classification of men in the army at that time.

ALBERT T. CLAY

Yale University

A new method of syntactical arrangement

Grammars fall roughly into two classes, the so-called scientific grammars, in which an attempt is made to marshal all the phonological, morphological, and syntactical facts of the language in question, with little or no regard for vocabulary and idiom, and the so-called practical grammars, in which vocabulary and idiom occupy the center of the stage, and as little attention as possible is devoted to the study of forms and constructions.

Many works of both classes are excellent in their way, but in no single instance does any grammar, so far as I know, accomplish what I believe should be the real purpose of every grammar, namely, to actually teach the language in question. By the term language here I mean at least that portion of it which is the common possession of all the people who speak it, the language of every-day life. The reason for this failure of grammar to teach language is not to be sought in the treatment of phonetic or morphological phenomena; there are many practically perfect pho-

nologies and morphologies. It lies in the unsatisfactory arrangement of syntactical material, and in the lack of a good plan for a systematic study of vocabulary and idiom.

The aim of the present paper is to outline a plan for the improvement of the first of these defects, the unsatisfactory arrangement of syntactical material. At a later time I hope to offer some suggestions with regard to the systematic study of vocabulary and idiom.

There are two well-recognized methods of syntactical arrangement.¹ First, the formal method, in which the uses of the various important words and forms of the language are explained from the point of view of the individual word or form, such matters being treated as, e. g., the use of the article, the uses of the various case forms of the noun, and of the various tense and mood forms of the verb, etc. Secondly, the logical method, in which the arrangement is based on the idea involved, all the various expressions for the same idea being grouped together, e. g., all the ways of expressing the definite state of a noun, all the ways of expressing the various case relations of a noun, the various tenses and moods of a verb, etc. Of these two methods the formal is the one which usually forms the basis of the ordinary syntax.

A third principle of arrangement, which is also employed to some extent in many syntaxes, tho I have never seen it formally recognized as a principle of arrangement, is what may be called the combinatory principle. Here the material is treated from the point of view of the combination of a word with its modifiers, and not from that of the individual form making up the combination. This third principle of arrangement, this practically unrecognized principle, must be regarded, I have come to believe, as the fundamental principle of any good syntactical treatment.

This conviction on my part is largely due to my study of Philippine languages. When I came to write a grammar of Tagalog, one of the chief of this group, a language in which words that stand to one another in the relation of modifier and modified are usually joined together by connective particles (e. g., *ang mabuti-ng tawo* 'the good man', guttural nasal *ng* being the connective particle) my attention was necessarily attracted to the importance

¹ Cf. *Die Sprachwissenschaft* . . . von G. von d. Gabelentz, 2^{te}, verm. u. verb. Aufl. herausg. von Dr. Albrecht Graf von der Schulenburg, Leipzig, 1901, pp. 85, 86; H. Sweet, *The Practical Study of Languages*, N. Y., 1900, pp. 125, 126.

of the combination in syntactical study, and ultimately I found it both advisable and necessary to arrange the whole syntactical material of the language on the combinatory principle.

This method of arrangement may be spoken of as combinatory syntax or syntax of combinations. The combinations it treats may be briefly summarized as follows: Most of the parts of speech may, in addition to their use as separate words, form the dominant element of composite ideas, each consisting of a modified word and one or more modifying ideas; the modified word is, of course, in each case the dominant element. For example, in the English phrases 'this good man', 'which old man', 'any old man', the word 'man' is the dominant element. The modifying idea may be expressed by inflection or agglutination, e. g., Hebrew *kalb-î* 'my dog', *hakkeleb* 'the dog'; by a single word, as 'this' in English 'this man'; by several words, as *ce(t)-ci* in French *cet homme-ci*; or it may be indicated by some peculiarity of the construction, e. g., in Hebrew 'I have no bread' is rendered by 'ên lî *lehem*, where the construction of the negative 'ên with the indefinite noun, expresses the indefinite adjectival idea 'no'. The element that expresses the modifying idea is not always grammatically dependent on the noun, e. g., in Hebrew *kol hā-'anāšîm* 'all the men', *hā anāšîm* 'men' is genitive after *kol* 'all'. The noun may be combined with about a dozen of these modifying ideas²; the verb, with a half dozen or more; the adjective, with three or four; and so on. The phrases thus formed may now be combined in the relation of subject and predicate to form simple sentences, and simple sentences may be combined to form compound, complex, and involved sentences. In other words combinatory syntax shows how to combine linguistic atoms, i. e., words, into linguistic molecules, i. e., phrases, and how to form from these linguistic molecules linguistic mixtures, i. e., sentences, of varying degrees of complexity. It is evident that such a treatment consistently carried thru will reach all the possible combinations in the language, and it is also clear on the other hand that any conceivable combination in the language must find its place all ready for it in the system.

The lack of adequate attention to the combination as such is a weak point in most grammars that deal with highly synthetic forms of speech, as, for example, Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit.

² Cf. my article *Comparative Syntax of the Combinations formed by the Noun and its Modifiers in Semitic*, *JAOS*, 32 (1912), p. 136.

Here, tho much of the same ground is covered in connection with the study of the syntax of forms, the points made very largely lose their full effect, because they are out of their proper connection. It would serve, for example, to give more concreteness and vividness to the teaching of Latin if the combinations of the noun with the various pronominal adjectives, demonstrative, interrogative, etc., were learned more or less as units, viz., *hic homo*, *qui homo*, etc., instead of practically the whole attention of the student being riveted on the pronominal adjective, with the indefinite knowledge added by way of appendix, that it may be employed on occasion to modify a noun. Similarly in Sanskrit instead of studying exclusively in a formal way the compounds which make up so important a part of the language, and which constitute one of the chief stumbling blocks to the beginner, how much more concrete and definite it is to regard them as variant ways of expressing the combination of noun or adjective with different modifying ideas, to teach a student, for example, that he can express the phrase 'his man' either by a compound, viz., *tat-puruṣaḥ* or by two words, viz., *tasya puruṣaḥ*. Moreover the eagerness with which the mind, working thru the mazes of a formal Greek syntax, seizes upon and holds such a statement as that the phrase 'the wise man' may be expressed in the three ways *ὁ σοφὸς ἀνὴρ*, *ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός*, or *ἀνὴρ ὁ σοφός*, indicates the naturalness and vividness of the method in question.

One special advantage inherent in the combinatory method, in which, as we have seen, all the possible combinations of a language are catalogued and discussed in a regular order, is the facility with which the syntactical phenomena of languages so arranged can be compared; and no one will deny that real progress in syntactical study is contingent on such comparisons.

The combinatory method, however, in spite of its manifest advantages is not meant to supersede entirely the formal and logical methods. The three methods must work hand in hand in order that all the phenomena of the language may be adequately treated. I believe that a good syntax should consist of two parts. First all the material of the language should be treated from the combinatory point of view; secondly, the same material should be discussed again from the point of view of the use of the various forms. Theoretically a third part, in which all the material of the language would be treated from the point of view of the idea involved, would be necessary to complete the scheme of a perfect

syntax, but in practise this is usually not necessary. It will, in most cases, be found sufficient occasionally to exchange the combinatory or formal points of view for the logical in parts one and two respectively. For instance in the case of such topics as indefinite pronominal ideas, and modal auxiliary ideas such as *may*, *can*, *must*, etc., it is well for the sake of completeness to add a logical treatment to the combinatory and formal statements.

Of course such a method of syntactical treatment cannot be carried thru mechanically; its successful application requires not only a thoro knowledge of the language in question, but also an acquaintance with the fundamental principles of linguistic science, and a reasonable amount of common sense.

I am thoroly convinced, after rather prolonged thought on the subject, and after using the method here outlined in my own study of a number of tongues, that there is no language which will not gain greatly by the application of this method to its syntactical phenomena.

FRANK R. BLAKE

Johns Hopkins University